

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/034,826	12/28/2001	Garrett Holmes	DKT 00054A (BWI-00055)	1464
75	90 08/20/2003			
Patent Docket Administrator			EXAMINER	
BorgWarner Inc. 3001 West Big Beaver Rd Suite 200 P.O. Box 5060 Troy, MI 48007-5060			DONOVAN, LINCOLN D	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
••	•		2832	
			DATE MAILED: 08/20/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		NU		
	Application No.	Applicant(s)		
	10/034,826	HOLMES ET AL.		
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit		
	Donovan Lincoln	2832		
The MAILING DATE of this communica	tion appears on the cover sheet w	th the correspondence address		
Period for Reply A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communi - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of the period for reply is specified above, the maximum statut - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will - Any reply received by the Office later than three months after earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a rication. lays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thir ory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MON 1, by statute, cause the application to become AB	eply be timely filed by (30) days will be considered timely. ITHS from the mailing date of this communication. BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).		
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed	l on <u>02 <i>June 2003</i></u> .			
2a) This action is FINAL . 2b)⊠ This action is non-final.			
Since this application is in condition for closed in accordance with the practice Disposition of Claims				
4) Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the ap	plication.			
4a) Of the above claim(s) 9-22 is/are w	ithdrawn from consideration.			
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.				
6) Claim(s) 1-8 is/are rejected.				
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction	on and/or election requirement.			
Application Papers				
9) The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.			
10) The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by t	he Examiner.		
Applicant may not request that any objec	tion to the drawing(s) be held in abey	ance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).		
11) The proposed drawing correction filed of	on is: a)□ approved b)□ c	lisapproved by the Examiner.		
If approved, corrected drawings are requi	red in reply to this Office action.			
12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to b	y the Examiner.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120				
13) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	or foreign priority under 35 U.S.C.	§ 119(a)-(d) or (f).		
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:		•		
1. Certified copies of the priority do	ocuments have been received.			
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No				
Copies of the certified copies of application from the Internat * See the attached detailed Office action to the second	ional Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	· ·		
14) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for	·			
a) The translation of the foreign langu	uage provisional application has b	een received.		
Attachment(s)				
1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTC 3) K Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Pape	0-948) 5) Notice of	Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s) Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)		
5. Patent and Trademark Office TO-326 (Rev. 04-01)	Office Action Summary	Part of Paper No. 7		

Art Unit: 2832

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

Applicant's election with traverse of group I, claims 1-8 in Paper No. 6 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the multiple areas of search for all of the claimed inventions would have been necessitated by the claimed subject matter. This is not found persuasive because each claimed invention is directed towards structure and circuitry requiring differing considerations and search areas.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-3 and 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perach [US 4,538,645] in view of Hamilton et al. [US 5,707,039].

Regarding claim 1, Perach discloses a control valve assembly comprising:

- a housing [40] defining an internal chamber therein;
- an electromagnetic coil [22] wound on a bobbin [38] coaxially mounted within the housing;
- an axially movable armature [72], having first and second ends, mounted in the internal chamber;
- an actuation member [74] extending from the armature;

Application/Control Number: 10/034,826

Art Unit: 2832

- a pole piece [46] operably associated with the armature;
- a valve manifold [12] including control passages [16, 18];
- first and second valve seats [figure 3];
- a valve [66] positioned for selectively sealing on the first or second valve seats;
- a spring [76] for biasing the armature; and
- control means [column 5, line 57-column 6, line 14].

Perach discloses the instant claimed invention except for a flux tube partially surrounding the armature.

Hamiliton et al. disclose a hydraulic solenoid having an armature [41] interacting with a flux tube [33].

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use the flux tube design with the pole piece of Perach, as suggested by Hamilton et al., for the purpose of increasing activation force.

Regarding claims 2-3 and 6-7, The specific control functions, bias states and valve positioning would have been an obvious design consideration dependent upon the specific application of the hydraulic valve.

Claims 4-5 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Perach, as modified, as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Barkhimer et al. [US 5,752,689].

Art Unit: 2832

Perach, as modified, disclose the instant claimed invention except for the valve being a ball valve.

Barkhimer et al. disclose a solenoid valve assembly having a ball type valve.

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time invention was made to use a ball type valve design of Barkhimer et al. for the valve of Perach, as modified, for the purpose of maintaining a superior seal.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Donovan Lincoln whose telephone number is 703 308-3111. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 8:30-5:00.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703-308-1920.

ldd August 9, 2003

> HINCOLACONOVAN PRIMARY EXAMINER GROUP 100